



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,135	12/23/1999	VISHVAS CANARAN	8790087-0003	7046

7590

04/09/2003

PILLAY, KEVIN
FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP
SUITE 4200 BOX 20 TORONTO DOMINION BANK TOWER
TORONTO- DOMINION CENTRE
TORONTO, ONTARIO,, M5K1H6
CANADA

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/471,135

Applicant(s)

CANARAN ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed 12/23/99.
2. Claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In reference to dependent claim 6, dependent claim 6 recites the phrase “web server”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Examiner’s suggestion of changing said phrase to “web browser” will overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bayeh et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,012,098 filed (2/23/98)

In reference to independent claim 1, Bayeh teaches the steps of:

Art Unit: 2178

- A software-implemented process for use in a computing environment having a connection to a network, for using servlets to isolate data retrieval from data presentation formatting (compare to “*generating a data structure representing a flow and associated forms for the application*”). See column 3, lines 63-67 & column 4, lines 1-10.

- The second type of input to the rendering servlet is an Extensible Style Language style sheet (compare to “*associating with the application a plurality of style documents*”). See column 9, lines 4-10.

- The data servlet processes the client request. The request will typically require retrieving data from some database available to the data servlet (compare to “*a processor for processing said application*”). See column 10, lines 46-50. The data servlet described by Bayeh teaches the processing of applications from the client. A servlet typically implements code to perform a specific task, such as retrieving information from a particular type of database.

- A unique data servlet might be created to retrieve data from a specific type of database used by the server. Similarly, unique rendering servlets might be created to format data according to different presentation requirements. See column 8, lines 52-59. The reference further teaches a second type of input to the rendering servlet, which is an Extensible Style Language style sheet. An XSL style sheet describes how XML information is to be presented as HTML (compare to “*for processing the generated data document and a selected style document corresponding to the client characteristics to generate the requested form*”). See column 9, lines 4-8.

Art Unit: 2178

- When the reformatted data stream is complete, it sends that HTML data stream back to the client's browser, to be processed by the browser for presentation to the user (compare to *"forwarding the form processed at the server to the client"*). See column 12, lines 13-16.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Bayeh discloses:

Preferably, the means for formatting the first data stream formats it as an XML data stream (compare to *"generated data document being an XML document"*). See column 4, lines 35-40.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Bayeh discloses:

The second type of input to the rendering servlet is an Extensible Style Language style sheet. See column 9, lines 4-6. The reference further teaches a rendering servlet receives data in a predefined format. XML is used in the preferred embodiment, to align with the format created by the data servlet. See column 8, lines 64-67.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Bayeh discloses:

When the reformatted data stream is complete, it sends that HTML data stream back to the client's browser for presentation to the user (compare to *"said form being a displayable form"*). See column 2, lines 20-45.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Bayeh discloses:

The computer will receive the message, attempt to find the data for display with the user's browser, and return the formatted information to the browser software running on the user's computer. See column 2, lines 32-36. The reference further discloses a second type of input to the rendering servlet is an Extensible Style Language style sheet. An XSL style sheet

Art Unit: 2178

describes how XML information is to be presented as HTML (compare to "client characteristics including a character display size of said client"). See column 9, lines 3-7.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Bayeh discloses:

When this scenario is implemented using the internet, the browser running on the client's machine accepts the data it will display in response to the user's request (compare to "said client including a web server"). See column 2, lines 40-45.

In reference to claims 7-12, the limitations of these claims are the apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 1-6, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yalcinalp	US Patent No. 6,507,857	filed (3/12/99)
-----------	-------------------------	-----------------

Britton et al.	US Patent No. 6,535,896	filed (1/29/99)
----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

Ricardo Rocha, 'XSP Processor, A Primer', Java Apache Project, 9/13/99, pages 1-31

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043.


The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML
April 4, 2003


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER